

**REMARKS**

Claims 12-14 have been cancelled. Claim 15 has been amended. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15-17, 22-24 and 28-33 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

3-6. Claims 12-17 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicates the term “*first sound generating input unit*” lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 12-14 have been cancelled. Claim 15 has been amended to obviate this rejection.

7-8. Claims 30, 22-24, and 28 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,574,514 to Tanihira (hereinafter “Tanihira”).

Claim 30 recites a vehicle sound system that provides an audio signal to a speaker system.

The sound system comprises:

- “a first input unit that receives a first priority value indicative of a first scope of authority that the first input unit has been assigned over the vehicle sound system;
- a second input unit that receives a second priority value indicative of a second scope of authority the second input unit has been assigned over the vehicle sound system;
- a system bus; and
- a plurality of sound system generating components each capable of communicating with the first and second input units over the system bus and being selectively controlled by the first and second input units via the system bus,

where the first input unit comprises an input interface that allows a user to specify the first priority value.” (cl. 30).

The sound system recited in claim 30 includes first and second input units, each having an associated

priority value indicative of the unit's scope of authority over the sound system.

The Official Action contends *"Tanihira discloses an audio/video device for a communication system. Tanihira's disclosure, in the environment of an automobile/vehicle, comprises audio, video and multimedia devices (electronic device(s) or unit(s)) – figure 2 – 63, 31-35, 41, and 43 – that inherently constitute as inputs units for receiving a priority value and having an interface, as evident by the fact that the priority value for each unit is stored in memory of the device which gives a particular unit function priority of another device based on the unit's priority value, which reads on a 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> input unit,..."* (Official Action, pg. 30). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is based upon an impermissibly broad and incorrect reading of Tanihira. Specifically, the Official Action points to and alleges that units 63, 31-35, 41 and 43 in figure 2 of Tanihira read on the first and second input units recited in claim 30. However, units 63, 31-35, 41 and 43 disclosed in Tanihira are not input units and these unit have no control over the vehicle sound system. Tanihira discloses 63 is a monitor; 31 is a head unit that includes an AM/FM tuner, a cassette player and a CD player; 32 is a cassette player; 33 is a CD player; 34 is a DAT player; 35 is a digital source; 41 is a TV tuner and 43 is a navigation unit. None of these units has a scope of authority over the vehicle sound system as recited in claim 30.

Significantly, a fair and proper reading of Tanihira as a whole indicates that the commanders 11, 12 are the units that control the system disclosed therein. However, the Official Action does not allege that the commanders 11, 12 read on any structure disclosed in claim 30. In addition, even if the rejection was amended to allege that the commanders 11, 12 read on the first and second input units recited in claim 30, there is still no teaching that the commanders include priority values indicative of their individual scope of authority over the vehicle sound system. The priority value disclosed in Tanihira has NO relevance with respect to scope of authority the controller has over the

control system.

In addition, Tanihira neither discloses nor suggests a system that allows a user to specify the first priority value as set forth in claim 30. That is, claim 30 recites that the first input unit comprises an input interface that allows a user to specify the first priority value. Tanihira neither discloses nor suggests such a feature.

As known, a 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection requires that a single reference teach each and every element of the claimed invention. For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Tanihira is incapable of anticipating claim 30.

9-10. Claim 12 currently stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,725 in view of Tanihira.

Claim 12 has been cancelled.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15-17, 22-24 and 28-33 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea  
Reg. No. 35,305  
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.  
1500 Main Street  
Springfield, MA 01115  
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102